DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 132 954 HE 008 539

AUTHOR	Mondale, Clarence C.
TITLE	A New Direction for the Urban University. A Report to the Richard King Mellon Trusts from the George Washington University.
INSTITUTION	George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Richard King Mellon Foundation, Pittsburgh, Pa.
PUB DATE	[75]
NOTE	29p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Development; *Community Programs; Foundation Programs; Grants; Higher Education; *School Community Cooperation; *School Community Programs; *School Community Relationship; Urban Areas; *Urban Universities
IDENTIFIERS	District of Columbia; District of Columbia (Anacostia); *George Washington University; *Richard King Mellon Trusts

ABSTRACT

The most important single outcome of the grant from the Mellon Trusts to the George Washington University (GW) was the development of the Division of Experimental Programs. This new division is centrally concerned with turning GW's Washington location to academic advantage. Under the terms of the grant, GW was to develop means to relate the "total resources" of the university to the needs of local communities, particularly poor communities. This report traces the development of the Division of Experimental Programs through the five-year life of the Mellon grant. Section 1 discusses the relationship that existed between the university and the surrounding Washington community prior to the receipt of the Mellon grant. Section 2 details the first year of the grant. Section 3 describes the attempts to take community-oriented courses out of the classroom. Section 4 tells of the advent of the first service-learning programs, which placed students in public, private, and other community agencies for firsthand observation and experience. Section 5 details the cooperative program established between GW and a Washington community (The Anacostia Project); early problems faced in attempting to match university resources with specific community needs are discussed. Section 6 traces the development of a new GW office to supervise grant-related activities. Section 7 evaluates GW's accomplishments during the five-year grant: lessons learned and observations made. (Author/MSE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED132954

HE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A NEW DIRECTION FOR THE URBAN UNIVERSITY

By Clarence C. Mondale

A Report To The Richard King Mellon Trusts
From The George Washington University

HE008539

Preface:

Throughout the turbulent sixties, cities and universities simmered–and some erupted–in the midst of the most profound urban crisis to face modern America. Cities were beset with problems of every variety, and universities were suspected of contributing to these problems rather than holding the key to their solution. In 1968, George Washington University, with financial support from the Richard King Mellon Charitable Trusts, quietly launched a new program aimed at achieving some measure of long-range compatability and cooperation between the university and its urban neighbors. A low profile for the program was considered imperative if it were to have any chance of succeeding. Reports from similar efforts elsewhere were far from encouraging. Our initial efforts were met with criticism from both inside the institution and from the greater urban community beyond the campus.

Taking a lesson from disappointing experiences here and on other campuses, decisions were made early that the university would not attempt to provide services directly to the city and that research on urban problems be rejected as too little and too late as well as inappropriate. What then was left? A new, yet very elementary question was asked and this traditionally-oriented university set about to respond to the inquiry: how can faculty members and college students endeavor to understand the problems of cities in general and Washington, D.C. in particular? A broad assumption was made: the wealth of history, research, and experience of today's urban center and its problems and prospects would be sufficiently interesting and challenging to enough students and faculty to encourage them to explore and examine seriously the crisis of urban America; to realize the far-reaching impact of such problems as poverty and crime on our total society; and finally, to motivate them to do something about correcting these problems.

The focal point of the effort, therefore, was to encourage students to learn about the city so that they could vote more knowingly on policies aimed at alleviating its problems, use their creativity and insight to contribute to the solution of these problems, and perhaps, follow careers that would be urban-centered.

Another assumption was accepted from the beginning: namely, that for many years to come, most Americans will be educated in conventionally structured colleges and universities. Therefore, we made no attempt to restructure the institution in order to respond to the crises of the cities. We learned, as did others, that housing, transportation, poverty, nutrition, crime, unemployment and other urban problems did not have neatly

organized parallels among the academic disciplines of a traditional university. Adjustments had to be made to bring the "subject matter" of urban problems into the content of university courses offered to students.

The account which follows reports a number of successes and many failures as the University progressed through the first five years of this effort. We discovered no cure-alls for the problems of the city. Neither did we find a model for university organization which is guaranteed to solve these problems. After five years, however, we do believe that both on-campus and off-campus learning which results in a more comprehensive knowledge of cities and their problems does lead to a greater understanding of urban America. In the long run, such an understanding promises individuals better equipped to deal with urban matters than heretofore. This program, which is being continued and being further modified and focused in its continuation, is both important and helpful to The George Washington University. There is some evidence to suggest that it has also been helpful to the city of Washington. If other universities or cities find useful guidance from our promising activities or our failures, the program will have been doubly valuable.

One added dividend must be noted and perhaps the most valuable of all—these experiences required us to re-examine time and again the mission of the university in today's world.

Lloyd H. Elliott
President
The George Washington University

Introduction

The most important single outcome of the grant from the Mellon Trusts to the George Washington University was the development of what is called the Division of Experimental Programs. This new division of the university is centrally concerned with turning our Washington location to academic advantage. It had its beginnings in the Mellon grant, and in the riddles posed by that grant. Its nature and functions are strictly related to an accumulated experience in the development of courses and programs incorporating local field-study, work-study and field-oriented research. The range of those courses and programs now goes well beyond our original and continuing concern with urban and poverty "involvement." The riddles posed by the grant, as we chose to address them, have provoked a very considerable reassessment of institutional purpose and practice.

Over the decade and a half preceding the grant, we aspired after what we called "excellence." We wanted strong departments, a distinguished faculty, and, by the standards of the time, a national reputation. We tended to look elsewhere, rather than to ourselves and our immediate surroundings, for models and inspiration. Like most other institutions of our kind, we were thus unprepared for the crises of the late 1960's. We were then suddenly faced with the need to justify institutional purpose and practice against charges of "irrelevance": to racial and economic injustices; to urban disorganization; to the why and whither of the lives of our students; and to the well-being of the larger society. Few of us had any clear understanding as to how to address this bewildering range of interconnected issues. It was at that critical juncture that we received the Mellon grant.

Under the terms of the grant, we were to develop means to relate the "total resources" of the university to the needs of local communities, particularly of communities of poverty. We reasoned that most of our total resources were in the form of faculty and students; that they could be made available to the local community through courses taught and research done; that our proper assignment therefore became that of inducing curricular change, so that appropriate off-campus involvement became a normal dimension of our academic programs. So far as we succeeded at that assignment, tuition income generated by field-related courses could assure their continuance into the post-grant period.

This report traces the development of the Division of Experimental Programs through the five-year life of the Mellon grant. It is arranged in sections in roughly chronological order, and details the most significant programs that were developed and tested during the five-year grant period. The cumulative experience gained through trial and error, success and failure in each of these "experimental" programs and projects became the foundation for the establishment of the Division of Experimental Programs.

Section I, "The City Around Us: GW and Washington," discusses the relationship that existed between the university and the surrounding Washington community prior to the reception of the Mellon grant. Early GW efforts to establish community-oriented programs, as well as faculty attitudes toward "outreach" programs are discussed.

Section II, "A Year of Exploration," details the first year of the Mellon grant: early administrative directions; the birth of the GW-Washington Project; preliminary consultations with GW faculty; early contact with D.C. public agencies; the first academic programs; and first attempts at new curricular development.

Section III, "Community as Classroom: The Uses of Field Study," describes our attempts to take community-oriented courses out of the classroom. Both successful and unsuccessful programs are detailed, as well as related logistic and administrative problems. Applications of a significant program development grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities are also described.

Section IV, "Learning by Working," tells of the advent of the first "service learning" programs—programs that placed students in public, private, and other community agencies for firsthand observation and experience. This new arrangement required a curricular reassessment, and generated debate within the GW community. The most popular "service learning" courses are described.

Section V, "The Anacostia Project," details the cooperative program established between GW and a Washington community, as a result of four Title I grants from HEW, and matching funds from the Mellon grant. Early problems faced in attempting to match GW resources with specific community needs are discussed, as well as the formations of the Anacostia Community Development Consortium (ACDC) and the Spanish Education Development Center (SEDC).

Section VI, "Culmination: The Division of Experimental Programs," traces the development of a new GW office designed to supervise grant-related activities, and eventually, to initiate and oversee interdisciplinary, community, and experimental programs for the university. The establishment of this unique university office reflects five years of experimentation and experience in curricular innovation and community involvement made possible by the Mellon grant. The first attempts at organization, design, and budgetary justification are discussed in detail, as well as the determination of goals, structure, and function for the new division.

Section VII, "Reflections on the Riddle," evaluates GW's accomplishments during the five-year tenure of the Mellon grant; lessons learned and observations made.

The story we have to tell is one of directed process rather than of novelty of concepts. What began as the GW-Washington Project became a means for testing out alternative strategies for learning within a conventionally structured university. It became an agent, among faculty and students, for field-oriented and field-based education. At issue was the degree to which such education should be incorporated within our normal academic offerings. We sought to introduce into what and how we taught the necessary and fruitful tensions between theoretical and experiential learning; between training and education; and between tactical and strategic research. Our approach was gradualistic and incremental. We explored mutualities of interest across departments and divisions and between the university and the many nearby urban communities. We experimented with course and program structures responsive to those shared interests. Relatively diffuse exploration during the first year of the grant yielded a few effective patterns for course and program development. As we became more confident as to just what was needed for their administrative support, earlier informalities of procedure became more regularized. By the end of the five-year grant period, what began as an externally funded project had become a permanent academic division of the university. The history of the development of the division cannot be told without describing the courses and programs that, year by year, constituted its reason for being and defined its functions.

We spoke of the riddles posed by the grant, with its emphasis upon local involvement, that have since opened up very general issues of institutional purpose and practice. They can now be stated, in terms of the general strategy just described. The riddle of riddles is: Can a conventional university develop academic programs furthering involvement in the local community and by that means strengthen itself, on its own terms? A set of further questions follow from that lead question. What are the relative strengths and weaknesses of classroom study and field-based study? How should classroom study be structured to best complement field-based study, and vice versa? What standards of academic rigor apply to the two in combination? What structures can be devised that incorporate true mutuality of interest between the community and the university, so that community interests are served, on their own terms? By what means can we respond to the above questions? How is serious interest in the questions to be induced within strong departments and among the most competent faculty? How are incentives to be built in, over the long term, to reward such interest? Field involvements often require unconventional arrangements for cooperation among departments and divisions; for definition of faculty loads; as to what earns how much credit and what constitutes a course; and for new kinds of adjunct faculty and "para-faculty"—how does a university conventionalize such unconventional arrangements without disrupting established procedures? How is the whole effort to be administered in such a way as to protect its integrity and insure its serving as agent for faculty throughout the university interested in curricular experiment and development? Faced with a fixed or shrinking budget, how does the university make room in that budget for new course offerings and requisite administrative costs? Given our strategy of *academic* involvement, this whole set of questions was implicit in the general charge of the Mellon grant.

We surely have not arrived at final answers to these questions, nor have we given each question equal attention. Grant-related activities have duly impressed upon us the complexities of urban communities and the complexities of the university. In spite of five years of concentrated activity, many segments of both the university and the city are unaware of the programs we will be describing. Other segments, aware that the programs do exist, keep their

distance. Under grant auspices we have, in effect, threaded through the many complexities on and off ca mpus to discover some few means, among a universe of possibilities, for "involved" education and research.

The questions raised in our attempt to relate this university to this city obviously admit of very broad application. All of us in higher education are concerned with the problem of responding to new students with new needs. There is considerable experimentation today throughout the nation in "alternative" institutions of higher learning—external degree programs; colleges without walls; "new" colleges organized on nondepartmental and mission-oriented bases; organizations catering to the needs of what used to be called adult education. The many "alternative" institutions have their value, but they are surely marginal to the general enterprise of higher education, which conforms to our conventional model. Thus this report on our experience and the evolution of the new division should be of interest not only to those concerned with urban studies, broadly conceived, but also to the many administrators and faculty members in universities like our own attempting to develop strategies for institution-wide academic development.

I The City Around Us: GW and Washington

Prior to the beginning of the GW-Washington Project, the relationship that existed between the George Washington University and the city of Washington was not antagonistic, but it was far from ideal as a base for programs of mutual involvement. GW is a private, nonsectarian university, located only a few blocks from the White House and the downtown business section. It enrolls about 15,000 undergraduate, graduate and professional students. Tuition and living expenses are relatively high. Funds for student aid are modest, since endowments are not large. The student body comes from predominantly well-to-do middle class backgrounds. Few students who come from lower-income families, black or white, can afford to attend GW. Many of the black students attending GW come from other cities. Just prior to the receipt of the Mellon grant, the university initiated an Educational Opportunity Program, which provides academic and financial assistance to about 40 new students each year. Through this program, D.C. high school graduates and other D.C. residents are recruited as students, but the total number of students assisted is small compared to the college-age population of the District. A number of local publicly supported institutions now offer higher education at relatively low cost. There are four other universities and several colleges within the boundaries of the District of Columbia.

The university is physically separated from the communities of greatest poverty. It is located in a mixed business and high-income residential section of the city. Because of an earlier decision to limit enrollment to present numbers, its land-use policies and its practices as landlord have seldom been cause for friction with nearby residents and businesses. By the same token, its physical and social distance from the city's problems make it seem remote and vaguely alien to the mass of the District's citizens.

This sense of remoteness was intensified by recent shifts in the population of the District and, particularly, by the events following the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. in 1968. Like other similarly situated metropolitan areas, the Washington community has experienced a large, low-income immigration in the years since the Second World War. Middle-class whites and blacks have tended, in response, to move out, to the fringes of the District and into the suburbs. To the recently arrived inner-city black and Latino, GW was scarcely visible. Needless to say, these poverty communities were but dimly perceived by our faculty and students.

Then came the assassination of King, followed by severe urban riots. The Poor People's Encampment at Resurrection City, in the summer of 1968, was only a few blocks from campus. Nearly one-fifth of available GW faculty volunteered to participate in what was called a Poor People's University, a series of short courses relating to issues of race and poverty. The venture had its elements of the pathetic and comic, but it did mark an initial plunge by our faculty into the actualities of the urban crisis. Just prior to the Encampment, the university had undertaken a survey of its programs, courses and other activities relating to urban and race-related problems. The results, published in May 1968, disclosed many scattered points of contact between the university and the community, but little coordination among activities, no organization to sponsor coordination and no provision for appropriate curricular change.

II A Year of Exploration

Upon receiving the Mellon grant, President Lloyd H. Elliott made a set of decisions that determined the direction of grant-related activities. He ruled out the establishment of a special research project or institute, as peripheral to the established departments and divisions, and to the life of our students. He decided that services to the community had to be integral to the academic mission of the institution and were not to be otherwise justified. He was concerned that our liberal arts students were not directly confronting and experiencing the complexities of the urban life that surrounded them, as a normal dimension of their general education. He appointed a member of the faculty of the college of arts and sciences to direct what was denominated the GW-Washington Project, and stipulated that that faculty member was to continue to perform some fraction of his normal duties, including teaching and participating in related departmental and college faculty activities.

In February 1969, I had received a small planning grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) to institute value-oriented field-study and work-study courses. When I was named Project director, it was with the understanding that the experimental courses begun under NEH auspices would become part of the larger Mellon-funded program.

The Project had an altogether informal structure, and a general but indefinite mandate. I came to the President with proposals for expenditures of grant funds; they were discussed on a case by case basis; out of such discussion gradually emerged informal guidelines for further such proposals. An important precedent was set when it was decided that the NEH-supported courses were to go directly to the Provost for review and sanction, rather than to one of the academic deans. The goal of the Project was to be institution-wide curricular development. The experimental courses were seen, from the outset, as modest first steps in that general direction.

The Project was to act as a catalyst among existing departments and divisions, deploying grant funds to enlist their support. This involved endless discussions among faculty, students and community representatives, many of them fruitless. It was uphill work. There was little recognition among the faculty of the need for the university to seek academic involvement in the city. The fact that outside support was available to that end did not, in their minds, legitimize the effort. It was perceived as external, or at best marginal, to departmental priorities. Community representatives, out of an ancient wisdom, looked for direct payoff in jobs or education for themselves and their own, with little conviction that faculty groups assembled could turn knowledge to their use. There was an unambiguous student enthusiasm for moving education off the campus, but it was diffuse, underdefined and in some degree suspect. None of the concerned parties had clear ideas as to just how to proceed. Under the circumstances, the President counseled and the Project kept a low public profile. Funds were husbanded for later use, with well over half of the money available for the first year of the grant carried over for later use.

The objective was curricular development. For that even to begin to take place, we had to discover mutualities of shared and serious interests. During the first year, most of what we did amounted to a kind of pump-priming. Community leaders were brought to campus to speak to students on the occasion of the opening of a new student center. A conference, jointly sponsored by the Project and by the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, brought together faculty from area universities with some officials from the D.C. government who were attempting to develop an annual social report. What was called the Community Leadership Development Program was established, providing some funds for paying black students at GW for work in local "poverty" agencies and for tuition for representatives of those agencies who wanted to take a course or two at the university. An American Assembly session on "The States and the Urban Crisis" brought together area planners, urban researchists and faculty. The Project gave support to the Workshops for Careers in the Arts, a black group housed at GW interested in developing a local high school devoted to the performing arts. It supported publication by our Legal Aid Bureau of handbooks describing to community residents their legal rights as to tenancy, welfare and domestic relations. It convened a weekend retreat for faculty and students in the social sciences and the humanities, looking for new ideas for field-study and work-study. A student liaison was appointed to work with radical, deeply alienated white students, in an attempt to form a channel of communication between them and the Project. Tolerance was established, at a distance, between the

undergraduate black student organization and the Project. Initial contacts were made between the university and leaders in the Anacostia section of the District, out of which came later Title I proposals. We were well into the first year before we fully realized that there was a sizeable Spanish-speaking inner-city community nearby. By the end of the year we had initiated discussions among faculty in education and in Spanish and the director of a newly established Spanish Education Development Center. President Elliott discussed with representatives of the Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area the possibility of an interuniversity program for the recruitment and support of graduates of local high schools. That first year and since, grant money has been put aside for the academic support activities (tutoring, orientation, counseling) of our Educational Opportunity Program.

A few short-term academic projects were funded, very often without any real prospect of continuing institutional support, as a further means of developing shared interests. A professor of psychology gave a special course for counselors at a "runaway house" nearby the campus, in an area where many of the most disaffected GW students lived. An instructor in sociology was given support for a research assistant to help develop plans for a seminar for agency representatives interested in problems of juvenile control. We supported a field-placed sociology course, located in a suburban poverty community. We participated in the recruitment and support of a new faculty member in sociology with professional interest and training in field study, work-study and the evaluation of social programs. Efforts were made to recruit a professor in political science to develop and direct a new undergraduate program in urban affairs. Discussions with faculty in the department of public administration led to planning for a new graduate internship program. Negotiations with the D. C. Office of Criminal Justice Planning resulted in a one-semester seminar examining the 1966 D. C. "crime report," directed by the head of the department of economics. We gave support to a Leadership Training Program for area educators, a kind of year-long work-study program; and contributed to the salary of an individual charged with evaluating research programs in the School of Education. Kenneth B. Clark was brought to campus to talk to faculty in the School of Education, and a contribution was made to his research group, then developing a "blueprint" for the D. C. school system.

Activities of the first year of the grant are described in some detail in order to convey a sense of the tentativeness of early grant-sponsored programs. During the later years, as program directions became established, such miscellaneousness was less and less tolerated. During the initial year of the grant, given all we did not know, it was almost required. It allowed us to discover shared and serious interests in the purposes of the grant, across departments and divisions and between the university and off-campus communities.

III Community As Classroom: The Uses of Field-Study

The first of our experimental courses, begun under the initial NEH planning grant in 1969, was a sophomore-level field-study course. It has been followed by what is now a considerable array of such courses. We now differentiate field-study courses from work-study courses and from field-oriented research, although each type shares traits with the others. The focus of the work-study course is the work placement of the student; the focus of field-oriented research is, of course, application of theory; the focus of the field-study course is the necessary tension between academic analysis and (to use a sociological term) the world of "action." Our field-study offerings are directed at the liberal arts undergraduate. A range of fundamental student motivations comes into play in the field-study course that is systematically disregarded in traditional classroom instruction. A student in a relatively strange environment learns about himself as he learns about others. He finds unanticipated personal and vocational interests interrelating with topics of study. Student support for this kind of course has been and remains high. Faculty support, after a slow start, continues to grow.

Our emphasis has been upon a kind of value-oriented field-study course. Ideally, such a course conforms to the following pattern: It concentrates upon contemporary issues of valve and choice facing citizens and the public order. The issues selected should be of lively interest to two or more academic departments, with the clear potential for useful field-study projects. The function of the disciplines is that of defining and sharpening the questions implicit in the issues rather than supplying some overarching conceptual framework. We see field-study as a means of giving three dimensions, in real time, to the study of the issues. We try to combine technical and professional competencies with qualitative and normative analysis. We try to involve practitioners in the field as class resources and as course planners. Further, the issues are defined in such a way as to touch the vital interests of the students, as individuals and citizens as well as candidates for a degree. We look for variety of points of view and background among students, as an important academic resource. The structuring of the course begins (ideally) with an extensive planning process, among interested faculty, students, and off-campus practitioners. Out of that process develop a selection of the issue(s) to be examined; an assemblage of resources, on campus and off; and a course

plan combining readings and lectures with small-group field study. We speak of "experimental humanities," a barbarous phrase found necessary to begin to convey our meaning.

The initial sophomore field-study course was sponsored by a Program in Experimental Humanities. There was no assumption that such sponsorship was long-term. It was a necessary expedient, given the lack of alternative sponsors. The course was taught by me and by Professor Roderick S. French, then and since my associate in NEH-funded activities. We wanted to interrelate the concerns of the humanities with those of the social sciences, with continuous and concrete reference to the city of Washington. The primary question posed by the course was that of how the process of urbanization had affected the values Americans attach to "individuality" and to "community." Since 1970, the course has been team-taught by professors from the humanities and from the social sciences. We have devised staggered terms, so that one of the pair has the experience of the prevous year behind him as help in planning the next year's course. Professors of anthropology, religion, English, sociology, psychology, economics and American civilization have participated as faculty. In each case, we have purchased released time, for two years, from the home departments.

One of a set of field-study courses provided for in our proposal to NEH for an institutional development grant is one entitled "Washington Culture and Politics." Here, again, the Program in Experimental Humanities sponsors the course. Professor French acts as coordinator, and professors from throughout the university contribute varying amounts of time on an overload basis. Crucial to the idea of the course is the employment of experts from the community as adjunct faculty. A graduate and several undergraduate assistants take delegated responsibility for field-study projects and for small-group discussions. Major topics of study include black social history; city planning; the struggle for self-government; the courts and the practice of law; and literature, broadcasting and theatre. The emphasis of the course is upon the "vernacular" rather than the "federal" city. Many of our freshmen and transfer students come to GW because it is in Washington, and yet our lower-level courses do little systematically to orient students to the city and to the academic departments of the university that make study of the city a principal concern. The large-enrollment course is designed to respond to that student need.

A first-year faculty conference of humanists and social scientists led to plans for a Summer 1971 Urban Ecology Workshop. A planning group of faculty, students and community environmental leaders selected five local issues for extended field-study. The leader of an Anacostia-based environmental project participated in the planning and giving of the workshop, and stipends were made available so that employees of that project could take the course. Out of that experience developed plans for a new large-enrollment course on "Environmental Issues," cosponsored by the departments of biology and geography and by experimental humanities, and taught by a team of three professors. A further outcome was the development of a small undergraduate major in environmental studies.

A Summer 1972 course focused upon the quality of social services delivered to the inner-city Spanish-speaking community. It followed the model of the Urban Ecology Workshop. During that same summer, a professor of Spanish began planning for a new course in "Spanish Composition and Conversation" incorporating field-study into what had formerly been a traditional classroom course. That course has since been adopted by the department of Romance languages as a regular offering. As an outgrowth of that course, the department has initiated plans for a new M.A. in bilingual and bicultural education.

The departments of art and journalism, with Project support, introduced a course in documentary photography. Grant funds were used to construct and equip photographic laboratory facilities needed for that course and crucial to the development of related courses. An award-winning black photographer taught the course the first time it was offered, emphasizing the visual aspects of life in Washington's communities of poverty. Student photographs became part of an exhibit at the National Collection of Fine Arts and at Goddard College. The course is now funded entirely by the sponsoring departments.

Prior to the Mellon grant, there had been no concerted effort to stimulate interest at GW in oral history. A workshop in oral history was introduced in Fall 1972, taught on a volunteer basis by professors of anthropology, history and American civilization. It has been reoffered, on the same

basis, in succeeding years. GW faculty and students are now participating in a city-wide oral history project for the upcoming bicentennial celebration. A summer course on the history of Washington, first offered in 1974, included a unit on oral history. In conjunction with that course, a noncredit workshop offered training to community residents engaged in local oral history projects.

Courses in value-oriented field-study as first introduced concentrated upon urban and poverty affairs. Course designs thus developed have admitted of much broader application.

Field-study of the "federal" city is the focus for a new small-enrollment, dormitory-based course in "The Contemporary Political Imagination." The course was jointly developed by the Dean of Students, the department of political science and the Program in Experimental Humanities. Thirty entering freshmen enroll for six credits in each of the two semesters of their freshman year. The course is issue-oriented, employing readings, case-studies, short-term work placements, and field-based research. Guest speakers actually involved in the cases being studied present a vivid sense of the richness, diversity and ambiguity of actual political behavior. During its first offering, a special arrangement allowed all of the students in the class to participate in a project monitoring campaign finances. The fact that the students are housed together on a single floor with a common academic concern surely deepens and intensifies the learning experience. By all accounts, the course is remarkably successful. A single instructor, jointly recruited by the three principal participants and appointed by the department of political science, teaches the course. A similar course, combining field-study and language training in French and Spanish, is to be offered in 1975-76.

Our most ambitious effort in value-oriented field-study is an annual "Conference on Policy Studies and the Humanities." The course design is intricate. It involves joint planning among students, faculty and agency representatives. Forty selected advanced undergraduates enroll for three or six hours of credit. The subject of the Conference changed during each of the last three years of the NEH grant. The course is expensive to give, and is intended as a means of involving new faculty members, and particularly faculty in the professional schools, in our program of curricular experiment and development. The first Conference, in Spring 1973, was at best a mixed success. It was coordinated by a professor of pharmacology and took as its topic "The Social Control of Drug Use." The course design, however interesting in the abstract, introduced unprecedented problems in logistics and administration. In planning for Spring 1974 we began with a scaled-down course design, taking as our topic issues related to freedom of information. Professors from our law school participated in the planning and contributed to a series of lectures. Field-study projects concentrated upon the press and the courts; information flow among the branches of government and to the public; and the development (or lack thereof) of cable television. At a small final convocation, invited experts reviewed student suggestions as to needed policy changes. Partly as an outgrowth of planning for the conference, we are now committed to a new course, to be first offered in Spring 1975, intended to orient liberal arts undergraduates to the practical workings of our legal systems. The course is to be taught by a senior professor from our law school, and is to be sponsored during a trial year by Experimental Humanities. The course plan calls for student field-study and for joint involvement between faculty in the law school and faculty in arts and sciences.

Other value-oriented field-study courses, more directly the concern of the NEH grant, deserve brief mention. In Fall 1972, professors of engineering, political science and chemistry cooperated in giving a course in "The Computer and Society." A promising start was made in organizing field-study projects drawing upon the wealth of computer-related activities, in both the public and private sectors, in the metropolitan area. The course was successful, but we have yet to secure commitments for its long-term sponsorship, and so it has not been reoffered. A course on "The United States and Japan," first offered in Spring 1974, was aimed at selected lower-level undergraduates. It was intended as a start in making available to those students some of Washington's unique resources for international studies. That course was planned in partnership with our School of Public and International Affairs.

One of the general objectives set by President Elliott for the use of Mellon funds was that of initiating our liberal arts students, at first-hand and for credit, into the actualities of the contemporary city. The present array of field-study courses (many not described above) forwards that objective.

Education in the liberal arts tends to neglect the near-at-hand. Student field-study can make accessible the materials for intercultural, interracial, interclass and interpersonal studies supplied in abundance by any major urban complex. We have learned to value the necessary tension between the valid counterclaims of disciplinary training, on the one hand, and citizen training, on the other. We see that tension as essential to the success of our value-oriented field-study courses, as a means of assuring seriousness of purpose. We think the same tension can forward important departmental interests. Faculty involved in those courses often bring back to their departments a new concern for means to enliven teaching within the disciplines; a new sense of interests shared among disciplines; and a new set of questions as to what departmental courses serve what academic ends.

In this highly compressed discussion of certain of our field-study courses, the reader can glimpse something of the range of topics addressed and the variety of administrative and sponsoring strategies employed in furthering faculty and departmental involvement in grant-related activities. Our courses had first to prove their worth. They had then to find sponsors and a long-term home.

IV Learning By Working

A second major emphasis of grant-sponsored activities was the development of work-study courses and programs. The work-study course is focused upon the student work experience, and readings and seminars are intended as means for lending perspective and enrichment to what the student is learning on the job, about that job and about himself. The assumption is that by careful selection among work placements, the student can deliver useful services to the agency in exchange for what the agency contributes to that student's education.

The initial grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities included provision for a work-study course for advanced liberal arts undergraduates. That course was first offered in Spring 1970. We placed 21 students in community agencies, on a half-time basis, and contracted with individual professors to supervise appropriate study projects. Student enthusiasm was inordinate; agency response was good; the faculty involved usually made a good-faith effort. That first semester's experience made clear that sustained faculty interest was not going to be easy to achieve. Traditionally trained faculty drew from research interests marginal to the work students were doing in agencies; or, at the other extreme, condoned an off-campus "trip," letting diaries or journals, and student enthusiasm, earn academic credit. We saw that we had a long way to go.

During the next two academic years, we began to group students according to work placements. It became clear that there was significant student and agency interest in sections devoted to public interest law and to public education. By Fall 1971, we had developed sections in education and in law, and in each case located professionally trained individuals to direct the sections, one a professor of education, the other a graduate of our law school, later to become a professor there. By Fall 1972, we were organizing a section devoted to health care, with participation by professors from our medical school.

In Spring 1972, after negotiations with the departments of political science and sociology, we formally initiated a Service-Learning Program. Our intent was to make the Program the agent of "contract learning" on campus, whereby a sliding scale of credits would be granted for individually varying types of work commitments. The attempt proved premature. Participating departments were skeptical as to how much in fact was learned through work-study, and instituted set formats for their courses, with a set number of credits earned.

At present we regularly offer three sections of "service-learning" in experimental humanities; two courses in political science; and two courses in sociology.

Each of the humanities sections is interdivisional in nature: one each in law, education and health care. Of these, the education section is the oldest. Students are placed in public schools, experimental private schools, and in education-related placements outside the school (e.g., museum education). They are expected to make a half-time work commitment; they attend weekly seminars; they submit a journal of the first month of their work experiences and do a research project. The objective is not simply paraprofessional training, and the course does not count toward professional certification. A professor of education teaches the course. Students earn six credits.

The law section attracts students intending to go on to law school. Students are placed in public-interest firms. Some of them work with a Consortium-sponsored Law Students in Court Program, assisting law students who are authorized through the LSIC program to represent indigent clients in court. Seminar activity introduces students to legal procedures and institutions, and emphasizes how the law serves, or fails to serve, the purposes of the larger society.

The health care section has gone through several changes. For three semesters a graduate assistant coordinated work placements, and a faculty member from the medical school acted as a kind of professional consultant during seminar sessions. In Spring 1974, the Associate Dean for Allied Health Programs directed the section. He has a serious interest in refining the techniques of work-study; in the need for some orientation to issues of health care among liberal arts undergraduates; and in improving the undergraduate preparation of students intending to go on to medical school.

All of the above sections limit enrollment to fifteen students. Only upper-level undergraduates are eligible.

Service-learning courses in the department of political science follow a similar format. Students are given three credits for the work experience and three credits for the concurrent seminars. A course on "American Political Behavior" places students in organizations attempting to

influence local and federal political decisions, and makes "influence" the topic of study. A course in "Urban Policy Making" places students in local and state agencies. In both cases, the courses are taught by professors of political science, and one such course counts toward a departmental major. Full costs of these courses have now been absorbed by the department.

The most ambitious effort in service-learning is that sponsored by the department of sociology. The department formally offers two courses, but students must enroll for both concurrently. The courses in combination amount to a semester-course, with students enrolling for fifteen credit hours. Each student spends at least 24 hours per week at a work placement. In addition, seminars meet three times a week. Academic requirements include journals; book reports; participation in the planning of seminars; evaluation of agencies; independent research; and term papers. The course examines local juvenile control and criminal justice systems. It attempts systematically to relate a set of sociological terms (e.g., "alienation," "race," "class," "conflict") to what students are observing and experiencing in their work placements. The course has been reoffered continuously since Fall 1972, and the department now absorbs all costs. A more or less formal evaluation of the course on its first offering confirmed that in the minds of the students the course had been extraordinarily successful.

Conforming to the work-study principle is a senior internship required of students in a new undergraduate major in urban affairs; a counseling center now in the planning stage, directed by clinical psychologists; the Community Legal Clinic; and expanded community-based activities in the department of urban and regional planning.

The urban affairs major is designed for students interested in careers in research and policy analysis. During the senior year of the program, a student is placed as an intern in an agency or research organization related to his or her occupational choice. The placement is for two semesters (six credits per semester), giving the student time to develop an understanding of the routines of the agency and a familiarity with its policies. It also provides practical work experience and a degree of competence in a specific subject area that will later be useful when students apply for jobs. Requirements for the major consist of 51 hours of upper-level courses, with emphasis upon the skills of quantitative research. The major first became available in Fall 1972, so it is relatively untested.

Funded by the university but appropriate to the purposes of the Mellon grant is a new undergraduate internship in clinical psychology. The undergraduates work in partnership with graduate students, and are placed in selected Washington public schools, offering counseling in personal and family problems that affect student performance in the classroom. A particular effort is being made to develop programs in the Anacostia schools. The internship is part of a larger plan for a counseling center in which students can be trained while delivering community services, on the model of education in medical schools. This program is just getting underway.

As an outgrowth of Title I-funded activities in Anacostia, our law school has established a Community Legal Clinic. The activities of the Clinic resemble those of a public-interest law firm. Law students earn credit toward their degree while acquiring practical experience in law as it affects communities of poverty. Students interview witnesses, prepare affidavits, take depositions, and do other work usually done by lawyers. Student projects arise from needs as defined by community leaders. Under the direction of a member of the faculty, students do research and prepare briefs for community groups. Students enroll for a new course, "Clinical Studies in Urban Law." Mellon funds supported the Clinic for two years; it is now fully supported out of the law school budget.

A separate grant from the Mellon Trusts supported fellowships in urban and regional planning during the 1969-74 period. The coincidence of the two grants made it possible for U&RP to greatly increase the scope and scale of its field-based academic work. The department has been a principal participant in our Anacostia program, to be described in the next section of this report.

Two graduate-level work-study programs, each successful as educational experiments, failed to develop needed budgetary support from home departments and from other outside sources, and so were terminated. An internship in public administration placed ten students each semester in ten different urban agencies. Mellon funds supplied student stipends for two years, and reduced support for a third and final year. In 1970, the Project provided a stipend in addition to a tuition waiver for each of ten participants in a Leadership Training Program directed at selected public

school teachers of demonstrated leadership potential. Interest among teachers was high: in 1971, 108 teachers applied for the 8 places available for D. C. teachers. Project support had been made contingent upon the securing of support from other sources. Adequate alternative funding was not secured, and after two years Project support was withdrawn and the program terminated.

All of the present offerings in work-study are assured of permanent status in the university curriculum with funds supplied out of tuition income generated. The work-study idea holds great promise. It promises a cooperative and exactly appropriate interrelationship between urban agencies and the university, bestowing mutual benefits. Institutional support for work-study, however, has been slow to develop. The professional schools, with some tradition of work-study and internship, are relatively tolerant of the idea of a clinical education delivering requested services to a host agency. Even among faculty in the professional schools, however, there is some prejudice in favor of more traditional forms of study and uneven support for the work-study idea. Among faculty in arts and sciences, that prejudice is much more pronounced and there is almost no tradition of clinical education.

Agency response to undergraduate student performance has been surprisingly positive. We have come to depend upon certain agencies for placement in certain work-study sections, and agency satisfaction, under those conditions, becomes predictable.

The undergraduate student, in spite of dramatic shifts in mood among the student population over the period of the grant, has uniformly insisted that the work-study course responded to what they felt to be fundamental needs. They have few chances to "try out" potential careers. They value the chance to reflect upon the work experience in classroom seminars. They resent the heavy-handed institutional distinctions made between education and training, arguing that each takes on full meaning only in terms of the other. They are much less distressed than are the faculty by a certain necessary disorderliness in the work-study courses. They seem to place a value upon underdefined and non-definable aspects of the experience as, for them, necessary to the reality of the learning they feel to be taking place. It may be that they have their point, and that a necessary disorder is essential to our most creative learning experiences.

Most of our arts and sciences faculty has been at best indifferent to such considerations. A debate within that faculty in Fall 1972 focused on work-study as a primary target. Opponents of the work-study idea argued that learning should be confined to the classroom; that training has no part in a liberal arts education; that experience, unless *contained* by theory, is uninstructive. By now most such matters are not so simply stated, but there are good if insufficient reasons for faculty resistance. The distinction between education and training is, among other things, a distinction in faculty status. Teaching, traditionally, is entirely in the hands of the faculty. In work-study the teaching role is in some degree divided among the faculty, the agency and the student himself. Work-study has won support in particular major departments, but among faculty in the college of arts and sciences generally it is rather tolerated than endorsed. Our efforts can have only a marginal influence upon such deep-seated faculty habit and interest.

Throughout the university, there is little significant faculty demand for more extensive experiment with work-study courses. Post-grant prospects for the work-study idea thus turn upon "external" pressures: new kinds of faculty recruited; the availability of added funds; the presence of appropriate off-campus initiatives (agencies need to become more self-conscious about how to make education a normal part of their mission); and, among all concerned parties, a determination to press for sound answers to important but uncomfortably unconventional questions. There is growing demand from state legislatures that public universities take their public service responsibilities seriously. There is increasing demand for valid but unconventional kinds of education among nongraduate and postgraduate "new" students. There will no doubt be increasing external pressure, in the relatively long term, upon institutions like our own, to develop the means for combining a rigorous education with placements in that larger and "learning" society just beyond the edge of the campus.

V The Anacostia Project

A third major emphasis of activities under the Mellon grant was that of "outreach" into local communities of poverty. We were determined that our outreach programs be directly related to the educational mission of the university. We attempted, in the Anacostia community and with the Spanish Education Development Center, to develop interinstitutional arrangements with at least the clear promise of yielding mutual long-term benefits to the community and to the university.

During the first year of the GW-Washington Project, Robert E. Cannady, Jr., was appointed Director of Community Relations. He initiated discussions with a community leader in the Anacostia area of D. C., and those discussions led to the development of a proposal for the funding of a neighborhood services program, under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965. In July 1971, the Project was subsumed under what was for a time called the Office of Program Development. A new position was created, that of Coordinator of the GW-Washington Project. The Coordinator was given responsibility for direction of the new program. Mr. Cannady acted as our field representative, reporting to the Coordinator, Mr. Gregory H. Williams.

Because of successive refundings under Title I and the availability of matching Mellon funds, our Anacostia project became our most ambitious effort at interinstitutional "invention." It deserves detailed discussion.

Agencies in communities of poverty seldom have experience in relating their needs to the resources of a university; they are characteristically understaffed and overwhelmed with other and more pressing problems; and so the university must help the agency develop its means for partnership with academic programs, in such a way as to leave the community in charge of its own affairs. Until real support is engendered among community leaders for jointly developed programs, a university like ours represents an easy and convenient target for community frustrations. The distinction of the Anacostia project is that we located in a particular neighborhood and rode out interminable frustrations and near-disasters, all in the hope that what began as an unlikely partnership might develop to the point where each of the partners, on his own terms, could regularly depend upon the other. We are satisfied that we made such progress as could be made, under the conditions just described.

The section of Washington known as Anacostia lies east of the Anacostia river. It has always felt a sense of isolation from the rest of the city. Statistics make clear that it is the most underserved section of the city. Since World War II, there has been an almost total turnover in population, so that most of the present population is young, black and poor. Much of the area is characterized by vast tracts of public and large-scale private housing, inadequate public transportation, overcrowded public schools, remoteness from health care facilities, poorly distributed shopping areas, and a patchwork of land set aside for alien public purposes (e.g., a home for juvenile delinquents; a hospital for the insane; a lot for impounded cars; a sewage treatment plant; a large military base).

During the first year of the Project, negotiations were begun with the director of a community center in the Congress Heights subsection of Anacostia. The center was an autonomous delegate agency of the United Planning Organization (UPO), and it went by the acronym of CHASE (Congress Heights Association for Service and Education). We proposed to Title I authorities a GW-CHASE program, which became the basis of subsequent activities. Participants from GW included the Office of Program Development, the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, a Consumer Help Center (based in our law school) and the fledgling Community Legal Clinic. The proposal provided for Community Fellows (students in law and in planning) who were to spend half-time on community-related problems. There was also provision for four Community Aides, individuals from the community who were to serve as liaison between "components" of the GW program and the Congress Heights community. Space was rented close to CHASE headquarters, to house the program. At almost the moment of funding, a policital fight developed within the community over the control of the CHASE program. It was some three months before the fight was settled, the outcome of which was that UPO took over direct management of what became Neighborhood Development Center #3. At that juncture, GW renegotiated with UPO for joint sponsorship of what then became the GW-UPO (Congress Heights) Program.

Articulation between the needs of the Anacostia area and appropriate resources at GW was slow to develop. One problem was coordination among the university "components." By the second year of the project, we had developed two committees, representative of the components, that collectively decided upon university program priorities. A Program Committee dealt with day to day problems. It consisted of the Director of Community Relations, the head of the Community Legal Clinic, and a faculty member from the department of urban and regional planning, with the Coordinator of the GW-Washington Project serving as chairman. An Executive Committee was responsible for major policy decisions. It consisted of a senior professor from the law school and the head of the department of urban planning, with myself as chairman. The Project Coordinator was an *ex officio* member of this second committee. Such collective direction was awkward but manageable, and was required in view of autonomy of departments within the university.

A second problem was workable liaison with leaders in the Anacostia community. Leadership in the community was unstable, and such leaders as survived had to learn very gradually what use a university could be to them. In initial discussions, community leadership concentrated upon immediate short-term gains—how many jobs for residents; what tuition benefits; what short courses for staff employees. In time, certain leaders became convinced that the program could offer them relatively long-term benefits, and that what was being developed with GW was worthy of extension to other institutions of higher learning in the area. Out of this realization came the formation of the Anacostia Community Development Consortium, an organization offering collective leadership for a number of community agencies (NDC #3, the Southeast Neighborhood House, the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum, the Anacostia Economic Development Corporation, and the Frederick Douglass Community Center). It amounted to a community equivalent of our university committees. ACDC has now appointed a coordinator, an equivalent to the Coordinator of the GW-Washington Project.

A third problem was the management of day-to-day operations in the community. Our first quarters proved inadequate (neither plumbing nor heating was reliable). We moved to new quarters at 2906 Martin Luther King Ave., S.E., in the heart of the target area. For some time, space was underused, for reasons we only began to understand. We had hoped that the building could be a site for meetings among community representatives. We found

those representatives understandably jealous as to where meetings took place, and so for some two years meetings between us and them took place in their quarters. We initially planned to place students and faculty at stated times in the community, available as consultants to community residents. To a limited degree this occurred, with the consumer center and the legal clinic. But faculty and students were understandably jealous of their time, and found clear advantages to doing community-related research projects on campus, close to their materials. The role of the Community Aides proved difficult to define. They performed useful chores in the community (e.g., getting out notices of meetings; setting up after-school programs in art and dance; developing exhibits in a neighborhood museum). Such activities, however, were marginal to the major university-related projects, and faculty and students began to plan "around" the aides, rather than with them.

ACDC offices are not located in the Martin Luther King Center. A special program for the hard of hearing, sponsored by a local college (Gallaudet), is now quartered there. We hope to expand interuniversity use of the facilities. This is appropriate to the purposes of ACDC, since it has as its special function that of promoting interuniversity cooperation in the development of Anacostia-based programs. We have redefined the role of the Community Aides, so that they are now assigned from the beginning to particular program components; further, they are now hired on a three-quarter time basis, as a means of assuring that they will be enrolled in college while working at the Center.

The final and principal problem is, of course, the designing of programs appropriate to the university and important to the community. In our 1972 Title I proposal, we described some of the structures we are trying to develop:

(1) Community institutes. Institutes can be short-term (a single evening) or long-term (a semester's course). They are characterized by joint participation among faculty and students, community residents, and individuals with delegated responsibilities for delivering services to the community. The department of urban and regional planning has held two short-term institutes. The summer workshop in Urban Ecology served some of the purposes of an institute. It concentrated upon Anacostia, and was offered in cooperation with, and with participation from, Anacostia organizations and residents.

(2) A community-directed planning process. Work done by the Community Legal Clinic and by the department of urban and regional planning, and the formation of ACDC, supply a basis for a community-directed planning process capable of (a) establishing community priorities; (b) monitoring critical planning indicators (e.g., zoning changes or variance requests, capital improvements programs, public transportation schedules); (c) undertaking issue-oriented research and analysis, in partnership with local universities; and (d) initiating proposals to appropriate government agencies.

(3) Community Associates. The attempt here is to develop methods of formally recognizing contributions made by community residents to university programs. Associates help as consultants to ongoing programs, as participants in the planning and giving of community institutes, and as participants in on-campus courses. Wherever possible, we try to devise programs in such a way that associates gain additional training and/or credit through their participation in our programs.

(4) Information collection and dissemination. There is clearly a need for both a central collection of materials bearing upon the problems of Anacostia and for means to inform community residents of important issues, meetings and events. ACDC is properly a vehicle for both. Our programs and those of other universities can help in organizing and building the collection.

The project which attracted most public attention and the most dramatic community support related to the issue of the appropriate development of a tract of land which includes the former Bolling Field and the Anacostia Air Force Base, now virtually abandoned. Members of the Anacostia community seek to have the land revert to the District of Columbia, for development in housing, business and public service uses. Relying upon a comprehensive report on land use in the Anacostia area developed by the department of urban and regional planning, the Community Legal Clinic prepared briefs for hearings on the issue. A symposium and conference was held, at which community position papers were presented and endorsed. Editorials in the Washington *Post* supported the community position. Public hearings extended from March through

May 1973, and resulted in a resolution favorable to the community. (The symposium and conference led directly to the formation of ACDC.)

Urban and Regional Planning devoted an entire course in "Advanced Planning Problems" to developing a comprehensive report on land use in the Congress Heights subsection of Anacostia. Both CLC and U&PR are serving as consultants as to the relative merits of projected subway routes, an issue of immense importance to the community and not yet resolved.

Other CLC projects include a study of the feasibility of providing cable, UHF, multi-directional or master antenna community television service to Anacostia, a rape victims' rights study; and a low income tax clinic. U&RP students have done a review of underused or misused tracts of land in Anacostia and are prepared to review alternative future uses of one or all of those sites.

Major objectives for upcoming years include broadened interuniversity cooperation and increased use of community volunteers. Project Accountability, an activity of Federal City College, has been videotaping short programs on issues concerning the Anacostia area. GW projects helped provide the subject-matter. One outcome was a television show, during prime time on the local public television station, featuring videotaped material and a community meeting at the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum. GW cooperated with the FCC project in the production of that program. Plans are being formulated for cooperation between GW and Howard University in offering a clinic on low-income tax problems. With ACDC housed at the Center, community partnership with GW projects is visible and manifest.

With each successive annual application for Title I funds, partnership with the community became less ambiguous. In Spring 1973, a neighborhood leader (now chairman of ACDC) stated flatly before a review committee that he would see to the building of the proposed ACDC with GW as a principal partner, whether or not he received further funding. This was not just a statement for the occasion. The very idea of ACDC had emerged out of a joint effort between the university and neighborhood leaders to protect a very considerable tract of land for neighborhood use.

Still, an organization like ACDC can only thrive as it develops in its means of continuing support. It is unclear, as of this date, whether that can be secured. The 1973 Title I grant, awarded to GW, provided for the subcontracting of one-half of the money to ACDC. The current Title I grant provided for the same sharing of grant funds. We have made overtures on behalf of ACDC to other sources of outside support. Grant funds have enabled us to carry the costs of the neighborhood Martin Luther King Center unilaterally. It is understood on all sides that post-grant costs must be shared among participants. We have encouraged two Anacostia-based programs sponsored by other universities to locate at the Center, and one has done so.

During the life of the Mellon grant, we have demonstrated that a university and a neighborhood of poverty can work together, with mutual benefit, *providing* there is outside funding to support the effort. In the absence of such funding, many of our programs will continue, but the effort will be to keep them at or near their present level rather than to extend and improve upon the primitive structures developed to date. A strong ACDC, increasingly sophisticated in relating community needs to university resources, would obviously reinforce those programs at the university seeking to develop neighborhood-based activities. But ACDC is just getting underway, in inauspicious times. Agencies in poverty communities (the members of ACDC) are now going through a cycle of underfunding. The university itself is struggling to make tuition income cover expenses. With the expiration of Mellon and Title I funding, it is difficult to say just how much of what we have built will persist over the long run. It would probably take another five years of funding at past levels to bring the envisioned interinstitutional arrangements to full maturity.

Our efforts among the Spanish-speaking have not had the benefit of Title I funding, and have had neither the coherence nor the scope of our Anacostia project. One major effect of those efforts has been that the Spanish Education Development Center, an organization several times on the verge of extinction, has, with our help, survived, and can now look forward to a modest expansion of activities. A second effect has been an increasing concern in the university curriculum with problems of bilingualism and biculturalism as they affect the Spanish-speaking. A number of graduate and undergraduate students, placed at SEDC, amount to a kind of continuing in-kind support

of that organization.

Many efforts to develop programs in conjunction with major D. C. government agencies are not here detailed. They have undoubtedly had the cumulative effect of increasing contacts between our faculty and agency researchers with similar interests. Three attempts were made to develop interuniversity programs through the local Consortium of Universities. For three different sets of reasons, these attempts failed.

VI Culmination: The

In the first section of this report, we speak of the development of grant-related activities as a story of "directed process." Succeeding sections of field-study, work-study and neighborhood programs suggest the dialectics of that process, whereby alternative modes of education are placed in tension with conventional faculty and departmental commitments, by the vary nature of the course and program designs under consideration. After our first exploratory year, we understood that process as the means by which grant objectives were to be incorporated into the curriculum of the university, on an institution-wide basis. We had yet to develop the means for directing the process. A second consideration became more important in the second and third years of the grant: if we valued our new capacity for curricular change and development, how were we to continue such activity into the post-grant years? By what procedures could we set aside funds, out of the university budget, for such a purpose?

An earlier section of this report describes the radically informal administrative structure characterizing the GW-Washington Project during its first year. As the scope of the Project activities increased, somewhat more formal structures were introduced. Within its first year, an assistant to the Provost began to act as liaison between the President and the Project. In Fall 1970, two committees were appointed, one to advise the President, another to advise me, to serve as periodic monitors of grant-sponsored programs.

GW delegates to a grantees meeting in Los Angeles in February 1971 began a discussion among themselves and with the President that led to the formation of an ad hoc committee, the purpose of which was to recommend to the President such administrative changes as seemed necessary for the support and furtherance of general grant objectives. By the time that ad hoc committee was convened, the university had submitted its proposal to the National Endowment for Humanities for an institutional development grant, and it seemed likely that the proposal would be funded. The NEH proposal included provision for an office to sponsor experimental courses and to administer the "humanities development" program.

The committee recommended that the university establish a new office. It noted three deficiencies in the

Division Of Experimental Programs

institutional structure of the university, relative to grant purposes:

(1) Lack of an adequate apparatus to initiate interdisciplinary and interschool experimental programs which reflect the University's goals and priorities;

(2) Inability to incorporate successful interdisciplinary and interschool experimental programs into the long-run academic program in a systematic way; and

(3) Need for a mechanism to coordinate the teaching, research and public service activities of academic programs, so that each contributes to the effectiveness of the other.

These three deficiencies were presumed to be interrelated, and their interrelatedness argued the necessity of a new office taking as its special province the initiation of certain kinds of new courses; the incorporation of such new courses as proved successful into regular university curriculum; and a continuing attention to improving the complementarity of teaching, research and public service.

The committee judged it important that experiments sponsored by the new office not be random in nature; and that their success involve something more than their popularity among assorted faculty and students. They spoke of the need to relate experimental programs to the "goals and priorities" of institution-wide academic development. The means by which such priorities were to be established had yet to be defined. That represented a fourth deficiency of direct concern to the office they were proposing.

On July 1, 1971, the President formally accepted the recommendations of the committee by establishing what was called the Office of Program Development. The emphasis in OPD activities was upon assuring that the new office complemented, rather than competed with, existing academic units. The office was to act as catalyst among those units. Changes were to be introduced in a marginal and incremental manner, through cooperation with departments and schools throughout the university. It was supposed that the office succeeded insofar as established academic units saw its success as being in their best interests. To further that end, it was specified that OPD did not have the right to confer academic tenure or permanent faculty rank. To that same end, experimental courses were not to become part of a new degree program; and the internal logic among those courses was not to become that of a sequence or set, or of discrete curriculum.

In time, a fifth deficiency in institutional structure became evident. The university had virturally no means for long-term sponsorship of successful interdisciplinary or interdivisional courses. In January 1973, the office was authorized to act as sponsor of such courses. With this change in function, the office underwent a final change in name. It now became the Division of Experimental Programs.

The present functions of the division may be summarized as follows:

(1) To act as short-term sponsor of experimental and interdisciplinary courses;

(2) To act as long-term sponsor and administer interdisciplinary courses or other programs which are not logically congruent with the objectives of any existing academic department;

(3) To evaluate the success of curricular experiments;

(4) To find room, by addition or displacement, for desirable academic innovations in the long-term academic year program of the university;

(5) To provide incentives for academic innovation congenial to the purposes of the several related grants, among departments and schools;

(6) To relate innovation to academic planning and development of the institution as a whole.

The bulk of the new courses and programs sponsored by the division are to be short-term and experimental. In the case of any given successful experiment, the presumption is that an existing academic unit of the university will assume its long-term sponsorship. The division will assume long-term sponsorship only in those instances in which the continued success of the course or program depends upon unconventional arrangements.

In securing teachers for its new courses, the division normally buys the time of regular GW faculty from their home departments. It can occasionally hire individuals from outside the university on short-term and special bases to teach, undertake research and develop special projects. It is authorized to buy the time of individuals in and out of the university, on a short-term basis, to develop proposals appropriate to the

division and to institutional objectives.

The director of the division reports directly to the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs, to insure that divisional activities are consistent with institution-wide priorities. A permanent Steering Committee, appointed and chaired by the Provost, oversees those activities.

In Fall 1973, the membership of the Steering Committee was reconstituted in order better to reflect faculty interest in and support of the purposes of the division. Senior professors of law, economics, education, sociology, psychology, medicine, and romance languages, all of them with a history of participation in grant-related activities, constitute the new committee. The new committee met monthly throughout 1973-74. Early sessions were devoted to a review of current programs. Later sessions became increasingly preoccupied with the review of proposals for funding by the division of course and program ideas initiated by other academic units of the university. Procedures for returning funds to the division for services rendered, agreed to in principle at the time OPD was established, were translated into a set of guidelines and a total figure arrived at: by present calculations, approximately $500,000 in university funds has been set aside for division use. An April meeting made recommendations as to new directions for program development, including special attention to entering students needing remedial help and to the development of strategies for responding to the needs of new adult student populations. The suggestion was made that the division begin a program of faculty internships, whereby GW faculty with ideas for program development would be released to the division, on a short-term basis, to test those ideas out. It was clear that all parties to that meeting, the President and Provost included, tell that the new division had survived its trial period.

In defining the fiscal policies of the Office of Program Development (in 1971) the planners had recognized the limitations on the means available to the university. The university depends heavily upon tuition for its operating revenues and must operate within stringent financial limits. Changes in the educational program had to be designed to take place as increments or decrements to the existing program—in the economic sense, as marginal changes. Fiscal policies designed to support the new office followed a like "marginal" strategy.

Initial funding for the office had been provided almost entirely from external sources. Three devices have been developed to assure the office returns out of university funds for services rendered. The office is credited with tuition income generated by the courses it supports. The office is credited with overhead cost recoveries incident to grants secured through its efforts. Finally, as an incentive for cooperation by departments and divisions of the university and as a source of income for the office, we have established procedures for what we call "breakage." "Breakage" works as follows: if the division buys released faculty time from a department for the teaching of one of its courses, it pays at the annual salary rate. Thus a faculty member earning $15,000 for the academic year, released for one-third of his time to teach an experimental course, would cost the division $5,000. Costs for a part-time instructor to replace that faculty member are nearly always less than those paid for full-time faculty. The difference between the full-time and part-time rates becomes the basis for breakage. Half of that difference is returned to the division, and half is credited to the department, to be used at its discretion.

Funds credited to the division are not handled as an annual budget, but are treated by fund accounting methods. A revolving fund has been established in the Provost's office, to accumulate them.

It took some time to translate the above general procedures into real figures. Based upon careful calculation for the 1971-74 period, it seems that income generated will be adequate to the present purposes of the office, even in the absence of further outside funding.

The evolution of the new division is one more instance in which an institutional response to the specific charge of the Mellon grant has admitted of much broader application. A number of interdivisional degree programs have been introduced or are under consideration by the division, to be directly funded by the university. A new Ph.D. program in Education Policy has been approved by our Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. It will be described in greater detail in the final section of this report. Divisional initiative was crucial to the convening of interested parties in area agencies, and of faculty and administrators throughout the university, that finally led to the proposal of the new degree. A master's degree program in Museum

Education, again involving cooperation across divisions and with off-campus representatives, received necessary start-up costs, and planning support, from the division. Planning for a master's degree program in bilingual and bicultural education grew directly out of our efforts in the Spanish-speaking community and the growing involvement of the department of Romance languages and of the School of Education in those efforts. It also requires the same complex of interdivisional and off-campus participation. Finally the department of philosophy is to introduce, with division support, a new M.A. in Philosophy and Social Policy. Professor French is to coordinate the new degree program. It represents a new departure for that small department, in a direction exactly appropriate to the purposes of the NEH grant and of the division.

The establishment of the Division of Experimental Programs has been our attempt to build in the sanctions, structures and incentives needed if we are to continue the momentum generated under the grant from the Mellon Trusts and from the several related grants. We repeat, with some pride, that present income is adequate to present purposes, even in the absence of further outside support. The continued growth of the division will, however, depend upon locating new sources of external funding. So far as it can offer cooperating departments of the university "add-on" support to their present budgets, it offers help at minimal cost. Regardless of the funds available to it, the usefulness of the office will continue to depend upon its ability to inspire confidence among the other academic units of the university, so that its success is seen, generally, as being in their best interest.

Our commitment to a strategy of incremental change has, to date, proved successful. That cautious strategy has not allowed us to play any considerable role in the recruitment of new faculty. The "inducement" of support among present GW faculty may, on occasion, prove to be inadequate as a total strategy for effecting desirable curricular change. We have suggested above that the furthering of the work-study idea may require quite new program initiatives. Present procedures defining faculty work loads frustrate rather than support team-teaching arrangements and the flexible allocations of time appropriate to clinical studies. Nonincremental change may sometimes prove necessary and feasible.

We speak above of increments and incentives. We say little as to decrements and disincentives. We have at present a number of tactics rather than a strategy to effect displacement of relatively undesirable present course offerings, as the necessary price, given a relatively fixed institutional income, of undertaking new and more promising curricular experiments. Some such displacement has in fact occurred voluntarily on the part of cooperating departments. But present sanctions are weak, and the issue of redeployment of fixed resources is obviously an institutional, as well as a departmental, concern. The university needs to develop a more coherent scheme for arriving at its academic priorities. In that process, the new division can only be one among partners, but it can make its distinctive contributions.

A few summary figures convey something of the scope and scale of divisional activities to date. In 1973-74, the division directly sponsored thirteen courses (some for one semester, some for the academic year). An additional ten courses, sponsored by other departments, were supported by the division. In 1973-74, students took 2,933 credit hours in courses sponsored or supported by the division. A total of 123 faculty members are or have been involved in major committee assignments and in the teaching of experimental courses. The total includes 72 faculty members from 21 departments in our college of arts and sciences; 11 from law; 16 from education; 7 from medicine; 5 from engineering; 9 from government and business administration; and 3 from public and international affairs. Of that larger total, 83 faculty members have been or are involved in the teaching of our courses. Seventeen courses initiated by the division (under its several names) have been or will soon be absorbed by other academic units, in sponsorship and in budget support. The division has participated in the recruitment of eleven new faculty members now holding appointments in traditional academic disciplines. The division has been directly involved in the development of two new B.A. programs; of a new clinical law program; and of two new master's degree programs. Virtually all the costs of the above programs have now been absorbed by other units of the university. A new Ph.D. program has been approved, to be inaugurated in 1975-76. Finally, over the grant period a total of $830, 738 has been secured from other outside sources.

VII Reflections On The Riddle

We said at the beginning of this report that the riddle of riddles posed by the Mellon grant was the question as to whether a conventional university could develop academic programs furthering involvement in the local community and by that means strengthen itself, on its own terms. On the basis of our experience, we feel confident that academic involvement in the community can indeed strengthen the university, and in fact can serve as a continuing impetus for revitalization of its academic programs. Educators, when they think of the issues at all, often speak of the city as a social laboratory. Community residents rightly ask, *Whose* laboratory? Long-term interrelationships between the university and the community must be jointly developed, yielding joint benefits. So far as academic programs are developed in such a way as to protect that mutuality of interest, any modern city abounds in resources for education, research and appropriate public service.

The academic discipline tends toward the compartmentalization and fragmentation of knowledge; the policy-oriented, field-based study required by the urban agency forces attention to extra- and transdisciplinary problems. The university delegates training to the professional schools and education to the arts and sciences. Work-study programs for the liberal arts undergraduate force attention to the necessary interrelationships between training and education. The conventional liberal arts education tends to neglect the near-at-hand. Our value-oriented field-study courses suggest the potential of "local" study for contemporary liberal education.

The urban agency can strengthen itself, on its own terms, through cooperation with the university. At the margins, students can supply useful supplementary manpower. The acceptance of students for placement in an agency serves as one device for the training and recruitment of new personnel. The large agency is likely to need help in its own attempts at program evaluation, research and development. There is a clearly emergent need for continuous retraining of staff, as a means of updating professional competencies.

A subtle but real effect of "involved" courses and programs is their emphasis upon interrelationships, among people and across institutional boundaries. There is a very general feeling that in the university and in the larger society, because we have valued specialization at the expense of human community, we have overcomplicated our language and our lives. In the right kind of shared relationships, faculty, students and practitioners see themselves as partners in a common enterprise, and in some small but significant degree put off to one side the ordinary insistencies of role and status.

Earlier sections of the report attempt to demonstrate that the academic program at GW has been strengthened by our emphasis upon field-study, work-study and field-oriented study and research. The Mellon grant has had a very considerable net effect upon the university over and beyond the development of the programs we have been describing. Grant activities have had the effect of furthering attention to practice and policy, as appropriate subjects of study; have served to increase interest in cooperation between the professional schools and the traditional academic disciplines; and have brought attention to the need for more deliberate institution-wide academic planning.

Activities under the Mellon grant have provoked interest in a kind of policy study, intimately related to and drawing from practice, that goes beyond narrowly professional training and holds great future promise for our university, given our Washington setting. Our study of the 1966 "crime report" for the District of Columbia, cosponsored by the D. C. Office of Criminal Justice Planning, suggests the kind of practice-oriented policy study we have in mind. Graduate students in economics, sociology and law participated in that effort. Our continuing interest in the study of socioeconomic statistics constitutes a second illustration. A newly recruited faculty member, who has served with distinction as a research statistician in several federal agencies, is now teaching a course for advanced students in the social sciences. That course examines the basic data bases used for federal policy decisions and selects for extended analysis special problems combining technical interest and important policy consequences (e.g., measures used to determine discrimination in employment).

The single most ambitious effort in the kind of policy studies we are describing is the new Ph.D. program in Education Policy. Our Institute for Educational Leadership, which develops informal educational programs for individuals in federal and state agencies concerned with education policy-making, was one partner in the planning of the degree program; the School of Education a second; a third

a group of senior professors in the social sciences who have devoted their careers to policy-oriented research. The program is intended to serve both those students who intend to pursue academic careers and those students intending to go into careers in governmental agencies and in large school systems.

The scope of this interest in practice-oriented policy studies obviously goes beyond the concerns of the Mellon grant. The growth of that interest has, however, been potently reinforced by projects and programs initiated under grant auspices.

There has been increased cooperation between faculty in the professional schools and those in traditional academic disciplines. Activities supported by the Mellon grant made the need for such cooperation obvious. Entry into the community of poverty depended upon cooperation from the professional schools. Community leaders could understand how our professional schools might deliver useful services to the community. Our work-study students are placed in agencies in which they are expected to serve as paraprofessionals. We found ourselves turning for help to faculty involvement. Our field-study courses are issue-oriented; to responsibly address contemporary issues (e.g., the computer and society; freedom of information), professionals have to be involved. The kind of policy study above described is impracticable without participation by faculty in the appropriate professional schools.

Columbia University has announced its plan for interrelating undergraduate education and professional training. We are not prepared for any such comprehensive plan, but we see the need for the involvement of faculty from our professional schools in contemporary undergraduate education, and for a broadening of professional training so as to address larger issues of public service and interest. Out of our cumulative experience under the grant there has developed a network of interests bridging traditional divisional structures.

Finally, grant-related activities have focused attention upon the need to develop institutional academic priorities. Our deans and department heads are conscious, to a new degree, of the need for self-study and change. Much of this new consciousness has no particular relationship to the activities of the Division of Experimental Programs. All units of the university are driven by a tight budget to search for new ways to economize. Deans and department heads have been made aware of costs-per-credit hour among our many academic units, and it is clear to everyone concerned that the university cannot afford to pay costs out of reasonable proportion to tuition generated. Our budget office has experimented with soliciting from departments their sense of their own strengths and weaknesses, and their short-term plans for departmental development. A committee of the faculty senate has recommended development of a budgeting process that might better correspond to gradually defined academic program objectives. In a piecemeal way, when the Steering Committee of the division says yes to one proposed program and no to another, precedents are established and with them some sharpened sense of institution-wide academic priorities. Further, the new division supplies a means by which new curricular directions can be practically tested in advance of long-term institutional commitments.

Contributing a central logic to these developments in academic planning is our Washington location. During these particularly austere times for private institutions of higher education like our own, we must more systematically define and exploit our relative advantages. Our supreme relative advantage is our location. The Mellon grant has allowed us to experiment with academic courses and programs that "open out" to our surrounding community. The emphasis of grant activities has been upon the "vernacular" city. Course and program designs suited to that purpose admit of adaptation and extension to the "federal" city. The grant has been of inestimable help in turning our unique location to academic advantage.

Acknowledgements

This report, as well as the activities it describes, is a collective effort. President Lloyd H. Elliott actively participated in preliminary discussions of earlier drafts of the report, as well as in the actual writing of those drafts. Carl H. Walther, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, developed the first complete draft report, which supplied the basis for review among participants and for this document. John W. Gardner met often with representatives of grantee institutions, acting as a friendly and perceptive critic of our earlier attempts to formulate what we were attempting and what we had achieved. Pablo S. Eisenberg participated as a special consultant during the final stages of the review of the earlier drafts, contributing to our discussion his particular combination of verve, concern and broad experience. Any shortcomings in this final draft of the report are, of course, my own responsibility.

It is impossible duly to acknowledge the many contributions made by colleagues throughout the university and within the Division of Experimental Programs to the success of the programs described in the report. The report names committees and cites numbers involved, but every activity of the division depended upon time and energy freely donated by individual faculty members, students and administrators, who, because of their numbers, must remain anonymous. Within the division, Robert E. Cannady, Jr., Augustus C. Edwards and Gregory H. Williams have given meaning and direction to our "GW-Washington Project." Roderick S. French has assumed responsibility for a wide range of administrative and curricular assignments, always carrying out his responsibilities with distinction. During most of the years here described, Cynthia Fortune has insinuated a cheerful order into our unpredictable daily procedures.